

Response to 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejection of Claims 1-10

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rowe (U. S. Pat. No. 4,305,854). Applicants traverse the rejection and have amended claim 1. Examiner asserts electron beam curable pressure sensitive adhesive (PSA) composition comprising 30-90% of a urethane (meth)acrylate corresponding to Applicants liquid elastomer. Applicants point out that urethane (meth)acrylates taught by Rowe are different compositions from liquid elastomers taught and claimed by Applicants. Applicants point to page 10, lines 8-17 which disclose that "The liquid elastomer is compatible with the at least one ethylenically unsaturated compound. As used herein, "compatible" refers to the ability to form a uniform mixture from the liquid elastomer and the at least one ethylenically unsaturated compound such that the two components can be mixed and applied onto a substrate before one of the components forms a separate observable phase. Although the liquid elastomer optionally contains functional groups, it is preferred that these functional groups remain substantially unreacted during the polymerization of the ethylenically unsaturated compound. Examples of such functional groups include epoxides and ethylenic unsaturations in close proximity to large blocking groups. Preferred elastomers are polymers that do not contain (meth)acryloxy groups". A non-reactive liquid elastomer is critical to the desired performance of Applicants invention. Applicants liquid elastomers include polybutadienes, polyisoprenes and polyurethanes which are different from urethane(meth)acrylates which are reactive through acrylate functionality.

Applicants also point out that a PSA is not equivalent to a cold seal adhesive as the latter have unique and distinctive performance requirements. PSAs are meant to have high tack and are intended to adhere to a second substrate (the first surface being the one to which they were originally applied). Cold seals, however, are intended to exhibit low tack and are only intended for self-adhesion (as well as to the substrate to which they are first applied). Moreover, upon peeling, cold seals are designed to fail cohesively (i.e. split apart). A critical test to differentiate a PSA from a cold seal is a blocking test in which the coated cold seal is placed in contact with a release coated film and placed

under pressure and heat. No permanent bond results after heat and pressure cycles for cold seals. In contrast, PSAs are designed to maintain adherence to such films under these conditions.

Rowe further teaches several times to the need to maintain permanent tack in the PSA (Col 1, line 43ff and Col 3, lines 1-2). Applicants specifically use non-reactive liquid elastomers to maintain low tack.

In summary, Rowe does not teach each and every element of Applicants invention. Applicants submit that Applicants invention is patentable over Rowe of record.

Response to 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejection of Claims 1-10

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C.102(b) as being anticipated by Lewandowski *et al.* (U. S. Pat. No. 5,747,551). Applicants traverse the rejection and have amended claim 1. Examiner asserts Lewandowski *et al.* discloses a UV curable PSA comprising from 0.1 to 15% of a photoinitiator. Applicants invention requires electron beam radiation which is different from UV radiation which is required by Lewandoski *et al.* Electron beam irradiation does not require a photoinitiator as required for Lewandoski *et al.* Applicants teach at page 3 and 4 and claim that the curable composition is substantially free of photoinitiator. In addition, the distinct differences in a PSA versus a cold seal are described above.

In summary, Lewandowski *et al.* does not teach each and every element of Applicants invention. Applicants submit that Applicants invention is patentable over Rowe of record.

Please charge any fees associated with this response to Deposit Account No. 18-1850. Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned to discuss any issues related to this application by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,



Dr. Stephen E. Johnson
Attorney/Agent for Applicants
Reg. No. 45,916
Telephone: (215) 619-5478
Facsimile: (215) 619-1654

Rohm and Haas Company
100 Independence Mall West
Philadelphia, PA 19106-2399
December 21, 2005